

**caBIG**cancer Biomedical
Informatics Grid

CTMS workspace Teleconference Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date

August 24, 2004

12-1 PM EDT

Attendees:

Working group coordinators: Chalk Dawson (Booz Allen Hamilton)

Harshawardhan Bal (Booz Allen Hamilton)

Participants:

Name	Organization	E-mail address
Ann Setser	NCI-CTEP	setsera@ctep.nci.nih.gov
Anne Tompkins	NCI-CTEP	tompkinsa@ctep.nci.nih.gov
Beverly Meadows	NCI-CTEP	meadowsb@ctep.nci.nih.gov
Brenda Crocker	UPCI	crockerbl@msx.upmc.edu
Charles Lu	Yale Cancer Center	charles.lu@yale.edu
Christos Andonyadis	NCICB	andonyac@mail.nih.gov
Diane Paul	CARRA	funnylady93@earthlink.net
Donald Connelly	University of Minnesota Cancer Center	don@umn.edu
Douglas Fridsma	UPMC	fridsma@cbmi.pitt.edu
Jieping Li	Lombardi Cancer Research Center	lj38@georgetown.edu
Jill Kuennen	U Iowa - Holden Comprehensive Cancer Center	jill-kuennen@uiowa.edu
John Speakman	Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center	speakman@biost.mskcc.org
Kim Diercksen	NCICB	diercksk@mail.nih.gov
Lori Wangsness	Mayo Clinic College of Medicine	Wangsness.Lori@mayo.edu
Mary Jo Deering	NCICB	deeringm@mail.nih.gov

Pearl H. Seo	Duke Comprehensive Cancer Center	seo00003@mc.duke.edu
Rhoda Arzoomanian	University of Wisconsin Comprehensive Cancer Center	rza@medicine.wisc.edu
Robert Lanese	Case Western Reserve - Ireland Cancer Center	robert.m.lanese@case.edu
Robert Morrell	Wake Forest Comprehensive Cancer Center	bmorrell@wfubmc.edu
Sharon Elcombe	Mayo Clinic College of Medicine	elcombe@mayo.edu
Simon Sherman	University of Nebraska Medical Center/Eppley Cancer Center	ssherm@unmc.edu
Sorena Nadaf	Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center	s.nadaf@vanderbilt.edu
Teri Melese	UCSF Cancer Center & Cancer Research Institute	tmelese@cc.ucsf.edu
Terry Braun	U. Iowa - Holden Comprehensive Cancer Center	tabraun@eng.uiowa.edu
Michael Davis	UPMC	davismk@upmc.edu
Becky Boes	UPMC	boesr@msx.upmc.edu
Andrea Hwang	UC- Irvine	ychwang@uci.edu
Marsha Reichman	NCICB	reichmam@mail.nih.gov

Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update on Baseline Contracts 2. Funded Workspace participation 3. Update on SOWs 4. CTMS face-to-face meeting Tuesday, 11/16 & Wednesday, 11/17 5. Report from SIGs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • caBIG compatibility: Teri Melese • Structured Protocol Representation: Doug Fridsma • Adverse Event Reporting: Joyce Niland • CTMS/CDUS Reporting: Rhoda Arzoomanian • Financial-Billing: Jill Kuennen • Laboratory Interfaces: John Speakman 6. Next Meeting 9/14/04 (3 weeks from now)
General discussion points raised by participants:	<p>Update on Baseline Contracts and SOWs and Funded Workspace participation</p> <p>24 centers had signed the base agreement, and another 11 had agreed to sign. The need for centers to file status reports – whether they were working group participants, developers or adopters - and highlight their contributions to the caBIG effort by means of the monthly status report was stressed. The centers should refer to the task order, which outlines what the individual deliverables are for each participating center. The monthly reports need to be regarded as progress reports that are submitted to the NCI and trigger payments for the activities that each center is involved in.</p> <p>Progress on SOWs: Two developer SOWs for UPMC (caBIG compatibility and structured protocol representation) were approved; in progress: three developer SOWs: City of Hope for the Adverse events system, UCSF and Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center for caBIG compatibility evaluation, three C3D adopter SOWs for UC-Irvine, Duke and OHSU and adopter SOWs for the UPMC structured protocol representation developer SOWs.</p> <p>Doug Fridsma raised the issue of the importance of coordinating the work of adopter and developers so as to identify interdependencies, points of collaboration and ways to work together on the grid. There has to be a two-way dialog where the deliverables within the developer SOWs can be linked to the resources that the adopters can provide (for example, help with user requirements gathering). It was agreed that the scheduling and deliverables obtained from the adopters as part of their contribution should coincide with the development activity of the developers. A joint project discussion at the appropriate time in the future should be planned to ensure that</p>

the work is progressing in concert as intended.

2nd CTMS Face-to-Face update

November 16, and 17th (Tuesday and Wednesday), City of Hope, Duarte, CA. Details will be sent as they become available. Travel to the face-to-face meeting is funded through the workspace participant agreement.

Updates from SIGs

caBIG compatibility Grading SIG: Need to clarify to the commercial vendors or participating caBIG centers that they cannot claim to be caBIG compatible at this point because the compatibility guidelines have not been defined. They can, however, be architecturally aligned with the caBIG spirit. Clarify CaBIG guidelines so participants can determine if they are compatible/architecturally aligned etc.

Understand the UPMC SOW on evaluating caBIG compatibility so others can learn from the UPMC experiences while creating their own SOWs. Doug Fridsma offered to send their SOW to Teri Melese.

Need to understand the difference between caBIG compatibility (actual exchange of data) and the architectural aspect (the pieces of software that will enable the exchange). Invite participation from the Architecture workspace and the Compatibility Grading SIG to the MedInfo meeting in September to join in and work towards establishing required milestones in as concrete a manner as possible.

The question of whether the compatibility guidelines will be stable or whether an on-going process will be required to capture the evolving compatibility standards as new technologies may emerge was raised. It was agreed that an initial set of requirements might need to be defined and modified as new experience is gained.

Structured Protocol Representation SIG: Identified cross-cutting participants from the structured protocol representation SIGs and other SIGs because it was important for the development of the protocol representation tool to understand how to interface it with Compatibility, Financial billing, Lab Interfaces and other modules of the CTMS.

In the process of formalizing relationship with CDISC and plan for a caBIG – CDISC meeting in the future to understand their work. Interact with HL7 during the development of the protocol representation tool to incorporate the relevant standards and processes.

CTMS/CDUS Reporting SIG: Agree on standards needed for data transmission as suggested by Warren Kibbe (Northwestern University) during the CTMS face-to-face meeting at Pittsburgh.

	<p>Obtain technical contacts for issues with data submission to the CTMS and CDUS systems</p> <p><u>Financial Billing SIG:</u> Create a graphical workflow to be sent out to centers to understand how institutions that do not have a financial billing process get the work done, in order to identify areas that can be automated.</p> <p>-Focus on automating the creation of a budget along with a study calendar as a first step. The workflow referred to above may help identify other areas for development as well.</p> <p>-Contact institutions that have home grown or demo systems to gather specs that the Financial Billing SIG could use to build a financial billing module. Doug Fridsma and Sorena Nadaf volunteered to help with any information that might help the Financial Billing SIG develop the specs for the budget and the study calendar.</p> <p><u>Lab Interfaces SIG:</u> Overview of work done to date was described. This included the design of the Lab Interfaces system, creation of an ERD diagram, understanding how to handle data from multiple labs, the need to have global lab ids and patient identifiers set up, how to enable systems to automatically download lab data where possible or have data entry interfaces, how to handle normal ranges and units that vary from lab to lab and the difference between tests and batteries of tests.</p> <p>Donald Connelly offered to present an overview of HL7 and thoughts on building a framework for HL7 v 2 to 3 message mapping.</p>
<p>Action items:</p>	<p><u>Compatibility Grading SIG</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enlist volunteers from the CTMS workspace to read the compatibility document and help expedite the process of clarification of the guidelines by suggesting changes in language, especially in relation to the Bronze, Silver and Gold levels, to the Architecture workspace and the best practices sub group. <p><u>Structured Protocol Representation SIG</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formalize relationship with CDISC. Interaction with HL7 during the development of the protocol representation tool. • Finalize structured protocol representation and protocol authoring tool SOWs. Work on a white paper on structured protocol representation. • Arrange for a meeting of CTMS workspace members at American Medical Informatics Association (AMIA) 2004.

CTMS/CDUS Reporting SIG

- Agree on standards needed for data transmission
- Compile results of the adverse events CTMS/CDUS survey along with Joyce Niland

Financial Billing SIG

- Create a graphical workflows and review existing financial billing systems from cancer centers

Lab Interfaces SIG

- Interface with the Adverse Events Reporting SIG for Lab to toxicity module.
- Obtain time lines for HL7 development and understand HL7 framework from Cerner/Sunquest.
- Naming of Lab Interfaces module (ca...?).